

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,417		09/27/2001	Richard Charles Allen	56233US002	3811
32692	7590	7590 04/17/2006		EXAMINER	
3M INNO	VATIVE	PROPERTIES CO	VARGOT, M	VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
PO BOX 33 ST. PAUL,	. — .	133-3427	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
, <u>-</u> ,				1732	
			DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

11
-

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/965,417	ALLEN ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Mathieu D. Vargot	1732			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHOWHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE as a solution of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Fe This action is FINAL. 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-23 is/are pending in the address of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-23 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
10) 🗀	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	(PTO_413)			
2) Notice Notice Notice	e of References Cited (FTO-692) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

Application/Control Number: 09/965,417

Art Unit: 1732

1.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 2

Claims 1-11, 13, 14, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application 457,607 in view of British Patent Application 2,326,727 for reasons of record.

2.Claims 15-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European Patent Application 457,607 in view of British Patent Application 2,326,727 and Sharp et al -240 for reasons of record.

3.Applicant's arguments filed February 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant submits that since British –727 is directed to making a cell wall that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have utilized general liquid crystal fabrication and alignment techniques set forth therein in the film making process of European –607. Such is simply not persuasive. One of ordinary skill in the liquid crystal art would know of various ways to orient liquid crystal films in making polarization rotators and whether such is described in relation to a film or a cell wall would have been of no patentable consequence. The fact that the primary reference suggests that the film be used in conjunction with a polarizer is prime facie evidence that the combination is valid, in that the secondary reference constructs the cell wall accordingly. It is notoriously well known to roll up films for storage and unwinding them from such a roll would of course be a necessity should these films need to be used at a later time.

Art Unit: 1732

While it is understood that the instant invention centers around making a film that can be wound/unwound, applicant must realize that such technology—ie, winding and unwinding of films—has been around for years and cannot be a basis for patentability.

Also, the fact that British –727 is directed to making a cell wall type LCD structure does not obviate the employment of a particular step taught therein in the process of the primary reference.

4.**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 571 272-1196. The fax phone

Art Unit: 1732

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot April 13, 2006 Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732

M. Varget

4/13/06